

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-24 are pending in the application.

Claims 2-24 are allowed.

Claim 1 is rejected.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 15, 16, 20-22 have been amended to correct minor claim informalities according to the suggestions of the Examiner.

### Claim Objections

Claims 1-24 are objected to for informalities. The noted informalities have been corrected. It is respectfully requested the claim objections be withdrawn. The objection to claim 4, lines 16-17 could not be located and no change was made.

### Claim Rejections

Claim 1 is rejected as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Shirakata et al. (U.S. 6,993,083, filed June 20, 2000) (hereinafter Shirakata) in view of Nakada (U.S. 7,020,116, filed Sept. 29, 2000) (hereinafter Nakada).

Reconsideration is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons:

Applicant's claim 1 includes the features of: "a receiver for receiving a signal that has been transmitted upon making the length of a guard interval added onto a known symbol larger than the length of a guard interval added onto a data symbol"

The Office Action points to Shirakata, the transmitted signal with a direct wave in Fig. 6(a) and the guard interval GI, known symbol "synchronous symbol" and data SYMBOL 1. It is argued on page 3 of the Office Action that the illustration shown in proper proportion with GI shorter in length than the "synchronous symbol."

It appears the Office Action is equating that the GI is shorter in length than the “synchronous symbol” as being equivalent to applicant’s claimed invention (see bottom of page 3 of the Office Action).

However, Applicant’s claim recites that the length of a guard interval added onto a known symbol is larger than the length of a guard interval added onto a data symbol.

Thus, according to applicant’s claimed invention the two guard intervals are different lengths. For example, see applicant’s Fig. 2 and page 15, lines 4-24 of the specification.

In contrast the Office Action appears to be comparing the length of guard interval GI with the length of the “synchronous symbol.” However, the “synchronous symbol” is not the guard interval added onto a data symbol.

In reviewing Fig. 6 (a) of Shirakata the length of the GI, which is added onto the “synchronous symbol” is the same and equal to the length of the GI, which is added onto the data symbol SYMBOL 1. This is also shown in Figs. 4, 5, 7 and 10 of Shirakata.

Thus Shirakata teaches different features than recited in applicant’s claim 1. Shirakata teaches the guard intervals on a known symbol is equal to the guard interval added to the data symbol. In contrast, applicant claims the length of a guard interval added onto a known symbol is larger than the length of a guard interval added onto a data symbol.

The cited reference Nakada likewise fails to teach or suggest the claimed features recited in claim 1, for example the length of a guard interval added onto a known symbol larger than the length of a guard interval added onto a data symbol.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted the combination of references Shirakata and Nakada fail to teach or suggest each and every feature recited in claim 1. Thus, an obviousness objection cannot be established and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the remarks set forth above, this application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-3894.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian S. Myers/  
Brian S. Myers  
Reg. No. 46,947

CUSTOMER NUMBER 61650  
Telephone: (973) 401-7157  
Fax: (212) 659-0424  
Docket No.: FJST 33  
BSM:GAM